DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 124 IR 008 609

AUTHOR Osterman, Dean N.
TITLE What's Happening with Instructional Development and Media? A Research Project.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 66p.
AVAILABLE FROM Information Futures, 2217 College Station, Corvallis, OR 97331 ($5.85 per copy).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Coordinators; Audiovisual Instruction; Department Heads; *Developmental Programs; Directories; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; *Instructional Development; *Instructional Innovation; Learning Resources Centers; School Surveys

ABSTRACT

Generated by the need to ascertain the involvement of media centers and instructional development centers in training faculty and providing assistance in instructional design, development, and evaluation, this study was undertaken to determine: (1) the identification of those individuals at colleges and universities nationwide who are involved in faculty and instructional development programs, (2) the services and direction offered by each program, and (3) the relationships of the development program to other institutional programs that support teaching and learning. This report is divided into eight sections: an introduction, a discussion of instructional development and media, the transmission of instructional innovation to faculty via a faculty development project, the instructional development questionnaire, analysis and implications, final comments, a directory of respondents, and references. Appendices include a memorandum and a copy of the questionnaire. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190124

A RESEARCH PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MEDIA?

Compiled and Written

by

Dean N. Osterman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, College and
University Teaching (CAUT) Project
and Instructional Development
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

©Dean N. Osterman, February 1980
All rights reserved

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dean N. Osterman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008609

5:27

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Paper

For the reader's convenience, this overview is provided to describe the organization of this paper. The paper is divided into eight sections: I. INTRODUCTION, pp. 1-2; II. A DISCUSSION ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MEDIA, pp. 3-9; III. TRANSMITTING INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION TO FACULTY VIA A FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, pp. 10-21; IV. INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE, pp. 21-42; V. ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS, pp. 42-47; VI. FINAL COMMENTS, p. 48; VII. DIRECTORY OF RESPONDENTS, pp. 49-59; VIII. REFERENCES, p. 60; IX. APPENDIX, pp. 61-64. As the main thrust of this paper is to provide a directory and analysis of the acquired data, several issues have been identified and provide content for discussion.

Background of the Study

During the spring of 1979, a questionnaire was sent to the directors of audiovisual or educational technology in colleges and universities throughout the nation to determine: 1.) the identification of those individuals directly involved in faculty and instructional development programs, 2.) the services and direction offered by each program, and 3.) the relationships of the development program to other institutional programs reporting to support teaching and learning. The uniqueness of this survey was its direction to the audiovisual or educational specialists and their routing it to the appropriate person(s) for a response. By having the original recipient of this survey instrument determine to whom it sould be sent, it was possible to gain insight as to which program is viewed as being involved with the developmental activities being considered.

In identifying those individuals directing the development programs, it became important to survey their characteristics, background, person(s) that they report to, problems, job descriptions, and other information regarding their profession. By gathering information about the services and direction offered, the author was able to compile a description of specific instructional development activities provided and/or their perception of instructional development. As the memorandum and survey forms (see appendix, item one and two) were forwarded to the directors of media programs, the intent was to obtain their determination of personnel involved in the instructional development program and the media director's specific viewpoint of the role of media programs in instructional and faculty development.

Need for the Survey

The need for this survey has been generated over lengthy discussions and descriptions in publications as reported by Diamond (1973), Ullmer (1971), Alexander and Yelon (1974), Davis (1974) and others. The discussions have been directed towards the involvement of media centers in training faculty and providing assistance in instructional design, development, and evaluation. The available literature describes organizational units within institutions assisting faculty in planning and evaluating instruction. These units (instructional development centers) are described with a separate charge as compared with the traditional services provided by a media resource center. It became evident that the instructional development function and media services may have different provisions for faculty. Therefore, it required a closer examination and observation of the instructional development function and its relationship to a media center.

II. A DISCUSSION ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MEDIA

The purpose of this discussion is to describe the instructional development function and its relationship to a media center. For purposes of clarity the writer will follow the outline as provided:

I. What is the ID function?
   - A. Role it serves
   - B. Typical ID jobs

II. The ID staff within a resource center
   - A. Double function
   - B. Provide workshops, seminars
   - C. Consultation, grants proposals

III. Autonomous Instructional Development Centers
   - A. Purpose
   - B. Examples

IV. Advantages and Disadvantages of Teaming ID and Resource Centers

V. Points to consider:
   - A. Objectives
   - B. Personnel
   - C. Budgets, financial support
   - D. Size of institution
   - E. Institutional's needs
   - F. Climate for innovation

VI. Comments

What is the ID function?

During the past decade and particularly in the past five years, an increasing number of colleges and universities have established centers, agencies, or programs whose purpose is to help faculty improve their teaching. A study by Centra (1976) found over 700 institutions having such programs with over one-third of the programs less than two years old.

Several reasons for the rapid growth of these programs have been advanced. As an example, the emergence of educational technology as a field of specialization provided both personnel and tools to address the complex problems involved in improving learning and teaching. Secondly, many institutions, as a result of changing enrollment patterns, new clientele, shrinking resources, and burgeoning knowledge in the disciplines, realized that improvement of teaching was not a simple task. On the contrary, it remains an arduous task requiring a long-term institutional commitment of personnel and dollars (Davis, et al., 1976; Gaff, 1975). Third, because of the general decline in the economy and resultant tightening of the academic job market, faculty are becoming far less mobile. With less turnover of faculty to stimulate new ideas and processes, the stimulation and renewal must come from within the institutions (Group for Human Development in Education, 1974). Fourth, enrollment in higher education has entered a period of continuous decline. Institutions must thus compete for a smaller number of students, or cultivate non-traditional populations. It is likely that improved instruction can provide a competitive advantage when recruiting potential students.

As a result of the need to improve the instructional climate, there has been a rapid growth of programs to improve teaching. Instructional development (ID) has been initiated in several institutions to focus on the systematic design, development, implementation and evaluation of instructional

methods, materials, lessons, courses or curricula.

ID serves as a change agent in respects to changing the instructional process or content; the faculty members knowledge, skills or attitudes, or the organizational environment. Such changes have been described by S.N. Postlethwait, et al., (1972) at Purdue University, and Fred Keller (Keller, 1968). These instructional changes (audio-tutorial and PSI) have been brought about by the ID process in a systematic method for finding, modifying, or developing new teaching approaches to fit non-traditional needs as described by Osterman (1978). To many practitioners of ID, this systematic process is defined in step-by-step models found in Briggs (1970), Davis, et al.,(1974), Kemp (1971), and Silvern (1969) among other.

Such related ID jobs that might be considered typical are as example: Consulting with an instructor to identify instructional problems and then planning to overcome these problems with alternative strategies and teaching methods. In the process of assessing the problem, it may by necessary to gather information about the students, subject matter, instructor's experience with alternative teaching approaches, teaching facilities, supportive funds, course objectives, and other related teaching/learning information. Once this information is acquired, the instructional developer will use this data in advising the instructor or redesigning the course. The effects of such changes are often evaluated observing the impact upon students' attitudes and achievement.

The ID Staff Within A Media Center

The ID staff within a media center will probably consist of one individual serving a double function of ID and as a media resource specialist. Such patterns of double functioning seem to be unclear in terms of the real ID function

served. Perhaps this is a result of lack of ID training on the part of the split job description or emphasis of the resource center.

The ID person may often offer seminars and workshops on improving teaching methods, use of classroom media, test construction, evaluation, and various other topics.

The main role of the ID person is providing consultation to instructors in ID and media application. There may be an emphasis or charge to use audio-visual materials in designing new courses thus creating additional jobs for graphic artists and bringing in revenue for these income-producing jobs.

Such organizations using this organizational approach teaming ID and resource centers are San Jose State University, San Diego State University, Washington State University, and Oregon State University.

Autonomous Instructional Development Centers

In contrast to the ID function within the resource center, other institutions such as Syracuse University, Michigan State University, University of Florida at Gainsville, and Iowa State University have organized a different approach for ID. The reasons for placing ID centers outside of the resource centers have been determined for various needs such as increasing performance of students, re-emphasizing the need to train professors in alternative teaching/learning approaches, helping faculty to improve student rating results, increasing accountability and cost effectiveness, attempting to remove the "media-phobia" that faculty exhibit, setting up centers to share teaching ideas and innovative approaches, and establishing a visible location for faculty to pursue consultation, mini-grants, evaluation aid, aids and materials prepared covering most aspects of teaching, workshops and seminars, and other opportunities to professionally improve teaching.

A few ID centers, like that as Syracuse University, have provided graphic art, photo, printing, and illustrations for specific projects developed through the center. Michigan State University ID Center (Center for Educational Development) is budgeted to purchase commercially made materials or purchase media assistance services supporting instructional improvement.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Teaming ID and Resource Centers

Advantages

1. ID consultation can monitor the use of software materials and can save institutional funds by overseeing and advising instructors in proper usage of materials.
2. ID personnel may work closely with the media staff to suggest specifications on software materials.
3. The resource center with ID may take on an added dimension beside the "stereo-type" of equipment storage and art work.
4. Office personnel, facilities, and equipment may be shared by serving both functions.
5. Joint workshops, conferences, and seminars may be sponsored and developed with the input of the ID and Media components.
6. Proposals may be written covering curriculum and equipment support describing how both functions can be served.

Disadvantages

1. One function (either ID or media) may dominate and thwart the efforts and initiatives of the other.
2. Supportive personnel may not understand or have sensitivities for the other function. That is, equipment-oriented personnel may not have

interpersonal skills to work with faculty and ID personnel may not be concerned about routine check out and delivery operations of media.

3. Granting agencies often will not entertain proposals from joint operations and functions suspecting that funds will be used to purchase equipment or services not implied in the funding proposal.

4. ID and media personnel may not have common interests, national affiliations, degree programs, and understandings of the importance of each operation. Conflict and disinterest may result.

5. Faculty may be so overwhelmed with media equipment and programs that they the ID function may not be noticed. It is a fact that faculty members are "turned-off" by media (no offense intended). As a result of this feeling, faculty are discouraged from seeking curriculum and ID assistance.

6. The ID function may not be allowed to grow and enlarge its opportunities, expertise, and professional input to faculty and students. This may be the result of shared budgets, facilities, personnel, philosophies, policies, evaluation procedures, administrators, directions and ingrained concepts.

Points to Consider

The writer would be the first one to argue in favor of continuing both functions, however possible. There are several factors to consider prior to establishing the placement of both functions (ID and media) and their relationship. Certainly, they should work together and recognize the importance of one another. Seemingly the following points should be considered in making decisions related to teaming the functions together:

1. What are the objectives of both functions? Can these objectives

overlap? Are the objectives best served together or apart?

2. Will personnel contribute to both functions?

3. Can both functions receive financial assistance and support to professionally operate and contribute to the institution?

4. Will the size of the institution provide a bottom-line decision in making a choice in the matter?

5. What are the institution's needs in both capacities? Does one function outweigh the other? Is equipment available with no expertise around to create or develop instructional programs and materials to be shown or used?

6. What is the institution's climate for innovation like? Perhaps neither function are necessary? Will one function (ID or media) stimulate the other.

Comments

The writer has developed several concerns about the interpretation of a media center and the present need to provide for further faculty needs in terms of programs with the purpose of improving teaching. The implications described in the literature imply that this need is not being served by media centers. The concern is why and how this need (instructional development) can be met. Perhaps, it would be best to stimulate new ideas and processes by developing ID centers with self-direction and independence or adding this function to media centers. A faculty development project developed at Oregon State University incorporates both instructional development and the campus media services. The following section describes this integration.

III. TRANSMITTING INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION TO FACULTY VIA A FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Creating an atmosphere for the motivation and stimulation of university professors toward teaching innovation is one of the most significant areas of concern in higher education. To provide for this need few colleges and universities have developed instructional programs in teaching methodology and media awareness for their faculty members. The College and University Teaching (CAUT) Project at Oregon State University is one example of a faculty development program teaming campus resources for teachers with instructional development. This section describes the project and comments on its methodology, acceptance by the faculty, and its success. The results from three case studies are presented so that the reader can judge its effectiveness for improving teaching at the university level.

Description of CAUT

During the last several years at Oregon State University many instructors have shown a strong interest in improving the teaching/learning process. Unfortunately, many faculty members do not know how to use available instructional services and some do not even know where to start in the process of instructional development. Instructors sometimes enthusiastically choose new approaches or methodologies only to become discouraged when they discover they have chosen inappropriately. They are frequently unaware of the research in teaching methodologies which support new trends and strategies. Without consultation with specialists, instructors find it difficult to evaluate new approaches.

Just as the quality of teaching is best measured by its impact upon

students, the quality of a faculty development program is best measured by the competencies it generates in students. Stimulating a given level of performance by faculty requires an understanding of how to produce competencies in students and how to measure the growth of these competencies. Comprehensive and readily accessible resources must be available to assist faculty in creating teaching technologies to solve these problems. Resources can aquaint faculty with new teaching techniques, help them integrate these techniques into course design and measure the effectiveness of the techniques in their classromms.

Recognizing the need to provide for instructional development, the CAUT Project at Oregon State University was created in 1974 through the Office of Undergraduate Studies. The CAUT Project is designed to provide services which will motivate and enable faculty members to design and implement an improved instructional process. These activities include teaching selected faculty members innovative approaches to instructional development and curriculum design. These innovative approaches stress learning processes, competency-based education, and other instructional forms which allow for increased instructor-student involvment.

The CAUT Project encompasses for the chosen set of faculty members a full-year with four distinct phases of instructional activities. The instructional activities themselves are designed to demonstrate by example the validity of the design techniques for improving instruction. Interpersonal communication methods are used to teach faculty about instructional innovations and technology. Instructional consultants are selected on the basis of their ability to work effectively with faculty. This process is emphasized throughout the four phases of the program.

The CAUT Project Phases

The four phases of the CAUT Project are as follows:

Phase I (Workshop session) consists of three weeks of daily sessions directed by several, nationally known instructional consultants plus the CAUT staff. Participants are exposed to several different teaching/learning approaches, some requiring extensive media. During the workshop period, participants are expected to develop instructional development plans for their courses under the supervision of the instructional consultants and the CAUT Project staff. This phase takes place in early summer. Campus media resource centers are fully demonstrated and integrated throughout Phase I.

Phase II (a two-month planning period) is used by the faculty member to design a comprehensive plan of instruction with the assistance of the CAUT Project personnel and campus resource departments. The instructional planning as developed in Phase I is developed into a more complete and well-defined instructional design during Phase II. The emphasis is on organizing and designing specific objectives, teaching strategies, and evaluation procedures -- rather than on materials development. This phase proceeds at the individual faculty members own pace. It fills the period between the end of the workshop (about July 1) and the end of the summer session.

Phase III (materials and teaching strategies development period) provides each participant with consultation and aid in developing course materials and necessary media. Again, this phase proceeds at the individual faculty member's own pace. In general the faculty member is putting together an instructional system for a particular course using the campus resource centers and consultation.

Phase IV (the evaluation period) is used to report the participant's

output through Phases I-III. Each participant prepares a report of the instructional design, its objectives and means of evaluation, the materials developed, use of media resource centers, and plans for future innovations. Faculty at this point report increased knowledge and awareness of instructional development and media usage.

Faculty Selection:

One of the fundamental problems faced by a program designed to improve university teaching is the voluntary nature of faculty involvement.

Even if a proven resource for instructional improvement is available, many faculty feel that merely asking for assistance is in itself an admission of inadequacy or incompetency. Presently, the CAUT Project addresses this problem by involving conscientious faculty who have expressed a desire for assistance by applying to and being selected by a departmental curriculum committee and a college dean for participation in the Project. Deans nominate faculty members from their departments on the basis of the proposals by faculty members to improve particular courses. The course proposals are evaluated in terms of number of student credit hours affected, type of course, faculty members need for the workshop, etc.

There are of course many faculty members who might be identified by their colleagues as "in need of the workshop" but are reluctant to work on improvement. Enrollment in the workshop has been robust in the past so no program has been developed to deal with those who might be "unwilling" participants.

CAUT Budget

The CAUT Project is funded by the University from state funds. The budget for the most recent year was $101,000. Each of the participants

receives a stipend from the CAUT Project funds for $1000 to attend the workshop. Participants also receive an additional stipend from their respective departments which averages $500 per participant. Thus a participant receives approximately $1500 for his nearly-full-time involvement in the three week workshop. No funds are provided by the CAUT Project for the additional phases of a faculty member's involement.

Some 180 faculty members have participated to date in CAUT Project training. They have been exposed to instruction in self-paced instruction, competency-based testing, audio-tutorial coursework, guided design, behavioral objectives, computer assisted instruction, test analysis, learning centers, instructional television, lecture techniques and the evaluation of teaching, and media usage.

As the quality of instruction is improved, it is felt that there will be a commensurate improvement in the efficiency of the learning process and in students' competencies. Past CAUT participants have responded through evaluation reports that the Project has been effective in improving teaching effectiveness. Feedback from students and administrators about the changes in the participants' methods has been supportive.

The following cases are provided as evidence of changes in students' learning, and as evidence of changes in the way students feel about the learning process.

Case I: Teaching introductory data processing with competency-based testing.

This section describes a teaching/learning experience in the School of Business at Oregon State University. The course is called Introduction to Business Data Processing, and the subject matter consists of approximately 40% data processing and 60% programming in the FORTRAN language. The

investigation was stimulated by the instructor's experience in the College and University Teaching Project at Oregon State University.

The instructor's desire was to develop a self-paced version of the course. The transition from the normal lecture mode of teaching to that of self-paced instruction requires a tremendous amount of time and effort on the part of the instructor. It seems to make sense to move first to some intermediate pedagogy. This particular study focuses on competency-based testing as an intermediate step.

Competency-based testing requires that the instructor develop examinations which measure the level of competency of a student in each of several modules which make up the subject matter of the course. Students in some competency-based testing schemes are allowed progress from one module to another only after having displayed some minimum level of competency on the examination over the previous module. This means that students are to be provided with a sufficient number of versions of modular examinations to demonstrate their competency. The author employed competency-based testing in an introductory business data processing course wherein numerous versions of exams were provided, but one's competency on one module was not prerequisite to work on any of the other modules.

Results:

The result gleaned from this "experience" are interesting. Comparisons between the two different administrations of the course (one as competency-based, one not) were made in terms of the proportion of students successfully completing the course, the grades they achieved, the overall level of competence they achieved, and their evaluation of the overall quality of the teaching of the course.

A slightly larger fraction of students finished the course under competency-based testing (87% vs. 80%). The difference in number of students finishing the course is statistically significant at the 5% level.

Students in the "control" group achieved an average grade of 66.30 with a standard deviation of 15.52. Students in the competency-based testing group achieved an average grade of 73.94 with a standard deviation of 10.80. It would appear that students achieved a higher level of competence in the latter group. Perhaps it is the case that they took so many exams that they became more proficient at exam-taking. The performance of students in the competency-based testing group was better with statistical significance at .05.

Students in the "control" group rated the instructor at 2.65 (on a scale from 0-4) which put his performance in the fourth quintile as compared with his colleagues. Under competency-based testing, this figure was 3.28 which was in the first quintile.

In gereral, the results show:

1. The average level of student competency is increased.
2. The proportion of students completing the course is increased.
3. Student satisfaction is increased.
4. The average grade of the course is raised.
5. Student evaluation of the teaching effort is higher.

Case II: A PSI approach to Managerial Accounting

The Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) is an alternative to the traditional lecture method of pedagogy. This set of techniques was originally presented by Keller (1968) and has since been utilized and investigated at many colleges in a variety of disciplines as reported by Ruskin (1974). The major components of PSI are: modulized course structure, written study materials, student self-pacing, student-peer proctors, competency-based testing and non-required lectures.

Description of the Instructional Methodology

During the fall term, 1974, at Oregon State University a variation of the PSI method was used in an introductory managerial accounting class. The basic elements of the course structure were as discussed below. When appropriate, the standard PSI methodology is compared to the specific variation that was actually employed. The instructor was introduced to PSI through the 1974 CAUT Project at OSU which has been previously discussed.

The course material was divided into ten separate modules covering the standard managerial accounting topics. For each module students were provided with a written study guide. For each learning module course study materials consisted of a set of behavioral learning objectives, a reading assignment, study questions for the student to answer while completing the reading assignment, a list of required problems, a list of recommended problems, and any comments, formulas, or examples the instructor desired to add to a particular topic.

Individual students proceeded through the course at their own pace. The only constraint was that the course grade at the end of the term depended upon the number of points the student had accumulated from module exams. Students were required to achieve a given percentage score (up to 100%) on a module exam before proceeding to the next module. Course grades were then determined by the number of modules completed.

Results:

1. The instructor has received three separate couse evaluations (on the scale described in the previous case) when using a traditional approach to introductory managerial accounting, and three evaluations when using PSI approach. The instructor's rating for each PSI section was higher than

any of the ratings from the traditional sections.

2. Each of the sections rated the relative time and effort required by managerial accounting compared to other courses. The results do not indicate any substantial perceived difference in the course workloads for the different sections.

3. Students were asked whether they would recommend the managerial accounting course to a friend, and how strongly they would recommend the course. The unanimous recommendation of the PSI class was very impressive compared to the average percentage of 69% positive recommendations obtained from the other sections.

4. Testing at the end of the course showed students in the PSI section scored consistently higher than their counterparts in the non-PSI section.

This case has described the implementation of a PSI variation for an introductory managerial accounting course. The author has found PSI to be a promising and enjoyable teaching method. In addition, a post hoc analysis of student attitudes and performance found that compared to students in lecture sections, students in a PSI section of managerial accounting had more favorable attitudes towards the course, and performed better on common portions of a final examination. These findings are not conclusive as they were not derived under controlled conditions. However, the findings are consistent with reported research on PSI in other disciplines as indicated by Corey and McMichael (1971).

Case III: The use of guided design in teaching management processes.

The Guided Design concept in education was developed by Charles E. Wales, Professor of Engineering and Education at West Virginia University and his colleagues. Guided Design shifts the emphasis of education from

transfer of information to the development of the student's skills in decision making. The instructor was introduced to Guided Design during the 1975 CAUT Project at OSU.

Under Guided Design System, classroom time is used for decision-making exercises by the student. Students are assembled into small groups and are given handouts which provide written instructions to the students who are to make decisions in specific hypothetical situations. When a group completes its discussion and feels reasonably confident that its decisions are appropriate, the group discussion leader goes to the instructor and receives the next handout which provides feedback or a typical decision made by an average group of students under the same circumstances. The next handout also provides a set of instructions for a discussion based on the feedback given. The instant feedback concept is a unique characteristic of the Guided Design System. Students are provided with instant written feedback at each stage of their discussion.

During the discussion, students are exposed to the values held by other individuals participating in the group activities. Through an examination of their own values and those of other participants, students develop broader and more mature values. The attainment of factual knowledge is expected to be accomplished by each student outside the classroom. To facilitate this process, students are provided with study guides and other self-paced learning materials. The basic philosophy of Guided Design approach is that an individual can achieve self-actualization through experiencing a decision making process which is based on knowledge and value.

The Guided Design approach was used to teach one section of a course entitled Management Processes while the traditional lecture approach was used in another section of the same course. The results indicate:

1. More student interest and involvement in the Guided Design section.
2. Traditional classroom design is a serious deterrent to the Guided Design approach.
3. Student evaluation of teaching ratings were not different between the two sections.
4. Differences in student competence could not be discerned.

The Guided Design approach can be used to supplement lectures and vice versa. When students are subject to Guided Design in every session, they seem to welcome a lecture by the instructor for variety.

Section Concluding Comments

The achievement of the CAUT Project seems to be noted in the increased motivation of instructors, and their improved teaching performance. Reports indicate higher student evaluation scores of teachers who have attended the project. Campus resource centers indicate an increased use of instructional resources by project professors. In addition, units are experiencing more effective requests for services. A final factor involved with participants is the spin-off effects to colleagues, students, and other institutions. The results of the professors' work has motivated peers to consider using improved teaching/learning ideas. In the case of the students, they spread the work about these new teaching systems to their traditional professors.

The three case studies in this article demonstrate the impact of one university's attempt to provide for teaching improvement by integrating instructional development and media resources in a faculty development project. The cases, therefore, speak to the effectiveness of organizing a faculty development project that provides an opportunity for project participants to explore the possibility of using a different teaching method.

The next section describes the methodology used in the survey to gain an insight of how media directors, then, view their role in instructional development and more specifically their views of ID and media.

Survey Methodology

The instrument (appendix, item two) was developed by the author to obtain the information as outlined in the INTRODUCTION section of this paper. Information Futures distributed the questionnaire to directors of media program at all postsecondary institutions (colleges and universities) throughout the nation. The file was developed from a consolidated mailing service as purchased from a commercial list of names broker in New York. Directors either responded to the form or forwarded the form on to person(s) regarded in the best vantage point of preparing the requested response. A total of two hundred eighty five questionnaires were returned with one hundred thirty names deleted. The responses to the survey were then compiled by the author. The summary of the data is provided in commentary implications of the survey.

IV. INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses from the returned questionnaires were compiled and analyzed. The tabulated results of this inquiry are as follows:

Do you hold faculty rank

Yes 172 No 112 Sometimes 1

Title

Media Director	81
Instructional Development	18
Director	15
Television Communications Director	4

(Title cont.)

Educational Communicator	4
Vice-President, Academic Affairs	2
Associate Director	4
Assistant Professor	5
Professor	6
AV Coordinator	8
AV Director	18
AV Technician	2
Library	24
Director of LRC & Head Educational Media	21
Dean of Instruction	4
Instructional Services	12
Assistant to President	2
Instructor of Television	2
Ananomous	53

Title of Position to which you report

Director of Learning Development Center	20
Director of Instructional Development	46
Academic Dean	30
Director of College Relations	1
Librarian	10
President	12
Director of Learning Resources	10
Provost	4
Director of Instructional Research	4
Assistant Superintendent of Instruction	2
Director of Media	10
Humanities Dept. Head	1
Chairman of a Department	2
Dean of Education	4
Director of Libraries	12
Dean of Instruction	52
Vice President	45
Regional Director	2
Director of Technology	2
Dean of Undergraduate Studies	1
Undeclared	15

Number of years in present position

Years

1. 71	6. 25	15. 2
2. 59	7. 8	16. 2
3. 34	8. 12	19. 2
4. 22	9. 14	20. 8
5. 10	10. 14	

Previous position

Professor	11
Assistant Professor	20
Media Specialist	30
Librarian	30
Assistant Director	28
Head Technical drawing	2
Assistant Instructional Resources director	14
Field Placement Coordinator	1
Business	2
Learning Resources specialist	16
Chairman Music	1
Director of Libraries	3
Director, non-related media	7
Instruction, English	4
AV Director	22
Television Production	11
Research Assistant	12
Graduate Assistant	5
Secondary Education	6
Secondary Technician, AV	2
Instruction, Various disciplines	12
Consultant	12
Engineer	2
Elementary Education	8
AV Production	22
Learning Assistant	2

What is your present age?

Under 25	2
25-29	4
30-34	62
35-39	71
40-44	42
45-59	36
50-54	40
55-59	16
60 or over	12

What kind of academic appointment do you have?

full time with tenure	120
full time without tenure	143
part time with tenure	8
part time without tenure	10
none	4

Do you have a part time administrative appointment?

Yes	64
No	158
Full time	63

Name of the school from which you received your highest degree

Over one-hundred different schools were listed with Indiana University receiving the most references.

In what department is your current appointment?

Student Services	4
Library	54
College Administration	8
Learning Resources	50
Christian Education	2
Media Service	50
English	6
Social Science	2
Academic Development	2
Education	20
Radio/TV	2
Secondary Ed.	2
AV	16
Curriculum & Instruction	10
Vocational, Technical	22
Forest Technology	2
Arts	4
Science	4
Psychology	2
Instructional Development	5
University Relations	2
Chemistry	2
Humanities	2
Law	2
Research	2
Communications	8

Are you currently the head of an academic department or academic division?

Yes 96 No 189

What is the highest earned degree you hold?

Undergraduate Bachelor's or less	2
Master's	162
Ph.D.	90
ED.D.	4
Other	27

How many professional journals in or related to your academic field of interest do you read?

journals	responses
1-5	134
6-10	124
11-15	20
16-20	3
20-30	4

How many journals do you receive or read regularly that deal with higher education in general or with teaching or teaching aids or methods?

0	8
1-5	175
6-10	86
11-14	6
15-20	8
25	2

How many regional or national conventions of your discipline have you attended in the past two years?

# of convents.	responses		
0.	36	6.	14
1.	32	7.	4
2.	80	8.	4
3.	54	9.	-
4.	34	10.	3
5.	24		

How many professional writings of any kind have you had published or accepted for publication in the past two years?

Publications	Responses
0	184
1	23
2	29
3	20
4	17
5	5
6	3
7	1
12	2
25	1

Are you currently engaged in any scholarly or research works which you expect will lead to publication?

Yes	121
No	164

Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or research?

Very heavily in research	4
Both, but leaning to research	50
Both, but leaning to teaching	127
Very heavily in teaching	104

How many regional or national conventions devoted to issues of teaching, learning or higher education have you attended in the past two years?

0. 90	5. 17
1. 48	6. 13
2. 60	7. 4
3. 27	9. 2
4. 22	10. 2

How many hours a week do you usually spend in the classroom teaching?

hours	responses
0	128
1	14
2	20
3	38
4	12
5	16
6-8	30
9-15	23
25	4

With which of the following groups do you have the strongest identity or sense of belonging?

my academic department or division	80
my discipline generally	70
my institution	96
my students	14
a special interest group across departmental lines	25

please name:

Colleagues
Learning Resources
Church Careers
Instructional Development
Media
Library

What percentage of your faculty would you estimate to be interested in Instructional Development?

percentage	responses
0-1	2
2-5	44
6-10	60
11-15	34
16-20	46
21-25	33
25-30	15
35	[illegible]
40-50	14
60-75	20
80	8
90-100	7

What sorts of working relationships does Instructional Development have with the Audio-Visual departments on your campus?

The responses, here, can be grouped into five distinct classifications:

	Responses
1. No Instructional Development program; none, no formal ID program	80
2. Separate groups (ID and media) cooperate with each other; informal relationships; excellent relationships; consult with each other; healthy relationship	56
3. There is no separate departments; ID is performed by the LRC, AV Center; LRC supports all instructional development; incorporated into one person; same staff; director of	

audio-visual and instructional development; AV and ID are part of library 93

4. AV Services provide instructional development activities such as selection and evaluation of all non-print materials, projection service, production of media. The media services center provide instructional development by providing media support. The LRC is instructional development, that of scheduling and screening of films and distribution of equipment. "Instruction Development" is considered a responsiblility of the media center, at least as it relates to instructional enrichment through the integration of a/v in the classroom. The Learning Resources Center provides ID which is library and media services, materials production. ID through the media program is locating teaching materials, making slides, videotapes, and transparencies. 22

5. Instructional development is the function of:
the library
Supervisor of Instruction
Director of Library Services
Department of Instructional Services
Office of the Academic Dean
Director of Instruction
Experimental Humanities Program
Faculty Curriculum Committee
Computer Technology
Vice-President Office
Office of the Academic Dean
Assistant Dean of Instruction
Faculty and Instructional Development Program 34

Briefly outline or describe the Instructional Development activities that are provided for teachers and/or students at your institution

	Responses
- Media production described as the instructional development activity.	40
- No instructional development activity offered	80
- Distribution of equipment, films, slides described as the instructional development activity	20
- Consultation in curriculum, planning out instruction, evaluation, needs assessment, systems approach to course development and design.	47
- Fund instructors who propose course development.	
- Fully developed instructional development programs	15
- Staff development including workshops and teaching skills session.	13
- Offer alternative teaching approaches.	2
- Workshops on use of media.	6
- Dean or administration provides instructional development activity.	4
- Team of a committee, resource personnel and ID consultant work with individual faculty for support, project developments.	10
- Occasional seminars, videotaped evaluations, discretionary funds for special projects.	11
- Faculty Development Committee deals with ID.	4
- Research/Design/Production/Implementation.	7
- Systematic process of ID available through Coordinator of ID	13

(Related individual responses)

- The Library/Media Center provides equipment and services (software distribution, audio & video recording).

- Catalogues of rentals - available in library.
- Associate Vice - Chancellor for Innovation oversees ID; uses private foundation funding.
- Classroom media delivery is our ID.
- ID as a concept is not well understood. Until I came, there was none.
- ID has suffered from lack of visibility, faculty interest, and administrative support.
- Reading lab, writing lab, special student services program (counseling, etc.).
- Cognitive style mapping; competency-based education.
- Help faculty with proposal writing.
- In a growing program, teachers receive individual consultation, workshops, seminars, colloquia, high quality student course analyses.
- ID activities include mediating a lecture, preparing media for learning modules.
- Slowly developing a faculty interest in media.
- Faculty - Instructional Development Workshops

What "problems" are faced by Instructional Development on your campus; in other words, where and what are the obstacles confronting Instructional Development activities?

Problem # 1	Responses
- Traditional faculty, resistant to ID; tenured faculty, fear of innovation, apathy.	45
Problem # 2	
- Inadequate funding for sufficent enough personnel, facilities, operating budget, equipment, funds for development.	54
Problem # 3	
- Lack of administrative support. Apathetic administrators.	31

	Responses
Problem # 4	
- Insufficient time.	22
Problem # 5	
- Lack of qualified leaders.	9
Problem # 6	
- Lack of ID personnel.	40
Problem # 7	
- Lack of release time for faculty.	7
Problem # 8	
- Organization, tie to Administrator.	2
Problem # 9	
- Little incentive offered to faculty. No rewards for teaching improvement.	7
Problem # 10	
- Communications with faculty.	2
Problem # 11	
- No budget for ID - comes out of AV budget	2
Problem # 12	
- No visibility of ID. ID not recognized for promotion and tenure recommendations for faculty.	14
Problem # 13	
- Lack of media equipment and facilities or specific media needs.	16
Problem # 14	
- Justification of ID.	4
Problem # 15	
- Part of the library system.	4

Problem # 16 — Responses

- Lack of knowledge of what ID is about; coming from media training. Need assistance in getting ID going. The ID function is served by the Audio-visual Center, so most of the design leans toward mediated methods and does not include design of courses and academic programs. Confusion with traditional AV support service. 15

Problem # 17

- Heavy demand upon media for non-instructional projects. 11

What solutions or steps have been taken to resolve these "problems"?

(Representative samples, much duplication presented)

Problem # 1

- Solutions:
  - Library/Media Director pushing for a faculty committee through administrative channels.
  - Working with individually interested teachers.
  - Committee organized to motivate faculty.
  - Low-key approach trying to sell the idea and capatalize on interest.
  - One-on-one conferences, workshops, demonstrations of classrooms applications.
  - Personnel made available to assist progress.
  - Awareness activities of necessity and benefits.
  - None
  - New AV and TV facilities may induce new interest.
  - Begin a faculty (ID) service.
  - Released time and/or reduced load. Building influential faculty up.
  - Active involvement in the T and P evaluation of teaching process.
  - Modeling good teaching.
  - Key individual faculty members interested in ID and media have been identified and are worked with closely, then they serve as examples.
  - Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty, fully back the faculty instructional development workshops.
  - Publicize success - "enlighten" faculty leaders.

- Newsletter to faculty.
- Resistance being overcome with demonstrations; workshops, one-to-one communications.
- Minigrants offered.
- Needs assessment being conducted.

Problem # 2

- Solutions:

- Educate Administration regarding needs.
- University is studying needs of Instructional Media Services, attempting to improve personal relationships.
- Committee organized to motivate and coordinate activities and interest.
- Grant writing and proposals for funding.
- Presentation to administration for a 5-year plan to bring the College into line with the CSUC System.
- None.
- Grant proposals to provide seed money.
- In process of securing funds.
- Grant requests to NSF.
- Request-request-NAG!
- Special research funds sometimes channeled to instructional development projects

Problem # 3

- Solutions:

- A couple of "fruitless" discussions.
- Expand topics and activities in Staff Development Office.
- The Faculty and Instructional Development office has been created and through this office grants are coordinated. Two members of this office work closely with the Vice President to evaluate and approve grant proposals.
- New President just provided an AIDP federal grant for ID
- Change of administration.

Problem # 4

- Solutions:

  * None
  * Some released time.
  * Organize committees and apply for grants.
  * Assess priorities.
  * Individual contacts by developer, willing to put majority of time necessary into project.
  * Scheduling of seminars, workshops, late afternoons and Saturdays.

Problem # 5

- Solutions:

  * Wait until retirement.
  * Have hired a New Vice-President.
  * Getting a new Dean this fall.

Problem # 6

- Solutions:

  * Grant money for faculty development.
  * Fund an efficient service providing ID staff.
  * Encouraging administration to provide services, budget.
  * Administration has now seen the need to add this staff as a means of keeping up with other universities known for excellence in teaching.
  * Currently testing feasability of opening a shop on campus with staff and materials to support individual and group instructional development requests.
  * In union contract to add ID staff.
  * Add support services directors.
  * Requests for more staff have been made.
  * Federal grant money has been used to hire additional personnel.
  * Ongoing requests for additional staff and support for this service.
  * Request for F/T i.d. coordinator.

Problem # 7

- Solutions:
  - Proposal has been presented to Academic Dean.
  - Very little.
  - Recommended to the VP that released time be offered.

Problem # 8

- Solutions:
  - Designated a staff member to work on this.
  - Attempting to create a stronger tie with Dean.

Problem # 9

- Solutions:
  - "Self-study" is recommending a study of organization.
  - Formation of the Teaching Learning Council and Teaching center.
  - Workshops with Financial assistance.

Problem # 10

- Solutions:
  - Working with 2 or 3 influential leaders.
  - Select faculty in communications to open up relationships with faculty.
  - Soon to be used individualized faculty development program.
  - Outreach literature to faculty.

Problem # 11

- Solutions:
  - Establishment of our own Instructional Development Center within the division.
  - Appointed to Chancellor's Task force on Faculty Development to serve funds and priorities for ID.
  - Separated ID from AV; developed financial support.

Problem # 12

- Solutions:

* Establishing high visibility, new brochure, word of mouth, newsletter.
* We just constituted the Instructional Design team in the last six months.
* Establishment of a faculty development center called, "The Teaching Clinic."
* Developing a "centralized" ID programs.
* The school has applied for a grant so it could hire a curriculum specialist.
* Campus committees publishing information about ID.
* Establishing one or more faculty contacts within each department.

Problem # 13

- Solutions:

* Assigned a staff person to work on this.
* Plans for constructing a new library next fall.
* None.
* Pushing state legislators for more funds.
* Nearly 35,000 worth of equipment has been purchased.
* Upgrading of equipment.

Problem # 14

- Solutions:

* Organizing a campus committee to provide the justification of ID
* Plan is being written upon Dean's request to justify staff for ID assistance.

Problem # 15

- Solutions:

* Reorganization of key areas - Library and AV under one dean - too early to tell if effective - but looks good.
* Once I was a librarian and believed the library, AV, and ID should be one operation; now that I am in charge of AV and ID - I believe the library and AV + ID have nothing in common. They <u>should</u> be separate!
* New librarian hired - will support ID.
* Working towards reorganized centralized ID program.

Problem # 16

- Solutions:

  - A recent staff member added to become director of ID.
  - Established an ID center with funded support.
  - In-Service presentation of ID.
  - Created a Faculty and Instructional Development office.
  - Develop 3- year faculty development plans.

Problem # 17

- Solutions:

  - Re-establish priorities.

Describe how you work with faculty to improve their teaching and learning environment.

(Various patterns of response)

- As a member of the faculty, I work with other faculty as a peer.
- There is no staff except Dean of Faculty and her assistant.
- Primarily by development of individualized learning systems, but we will help lecturers with organization and presentation of material.
- The library offers its services.
- Technical support provided.
- Inform them about materials and provide discussion of practices and methods - also self-evaluation through video-audio recordings.
- Search and recommend media materials.
- Provide AV media services.
- The faculty identify areas of improvement and develop a plan to show growth in the weak areas.
- Provide library services.
- Faculty development Committee established as permanent standing committee with assistance of Academic Associate Dean and director of ID.
- We try to get the instructor to think in terms of instructional objectives and essential content. Once this has been determined

then we try to develop a comfortable mode of presentation allowing for the instructor's comfort and attributes while using some new techniques. If the instructor experiences success, usually they become more open to relying less on what has been successful or mediocre in the past and more open to new and different teaching techniques.

- Inform faculty of what's happening in the ID field; occasionally have in-service workshops.
- Personal conferences, workshops, seminars demonstrating methods and materials. Videotape instructors in teaching sessions, with follow-up evaluations.
- Plan activities with group participation in the planning
- Participation in Faculty Development Project.
- Avoid involving faculty with physical burden - help them to obtain needed visual aids.
- Consult with a few faculty each year about instructional problems at their instigation.
- Introduction to various options, demonstrations of available options-hands-on workshops - curriculum planning.
- Research on commercially made materials and developing custom instructional materials.
- By recommending media purchases and delivering equipment.
- Faculty members are given release time to work with me on the modules for undergraduate requirements; I suggest alternatives.
- Ad Hoc Committee.
- Explain ID, propose alternative relationships, consult (analysis & design), facilitate media productions, participate in evaluation.
- Use a team approach to ID.
- Conduct demonstrations, lectures, and inservice workshops for faculty.
- Media staff assisting faculty not telling them how to do their job.
- Very carefully, low-key non-threatening.
- Provide Faculty and Instructional Development supported with media.
- Locate faculty willing to innovate.
- Working towards centralized ID program.

- Teaching clinic, faculty development reading room, personal consultation and production.
- Invite and seek out interested faculty - most effective.

Briefly, describe the Instructional Development staff; and their unique services to faculty.

(Various organizational ID systems)

- Media producers and AV designers; production services, workshops for their students.
- Inform faculty about library services; have good fiction and periodical collections.
- Dean - works with faculty on Design and implementation;
  ID Coordinator - same;
  Media Production Assistant - develops media.
- Professional library staff advises about research and production; technical staff produce material desired.
- Just the Dean at this point.
- No segmented staff - all integrated.
- Staff of three deans, a media specialist, the LMC director and branch librarian who discuss various aspects of ID with instructors.
- No staff; I have responsibility of stimulating ID activity.
- The faculty and Instructional Development Program staff involves a mix of proven successful teachers who work as part time associates (usually 1/4 time), several full time people with a background in teaching and instructional development, and a team of instructional media personnel who have a background in instructional technology for teaching and media production. Since this program is less than one month old in this present configuration, we are feeling our way. However, the goal is to use the above described team on major projects having significant impact on a large number of students and on or off campus instructional situations.
- I am ID staff making all services available to the faculty. My belief is that media must serve faculty. It is always available.

- Three full time: Director of ID, AV technician, media developer serving faculty with support.
- Full-time Educational Development Officer - Committee on Instruction comprised of one faculty representative from each division.
- Instructional development staff is getting new facility to include more and more instructional development.
- Faculty and staff members combined in a developmental stage at present.
- Director with two trained staff members serving ID needs.
- It would be stretching the truth to say that we have what could be considered an "instructional development" staff. We need one badly - currently we have concerned professional people caring about developmental responsibilities.
- Staffed to accomplish the production of original art work.
- I am it. And generally I suspect faculty think of me as someone who can do you a lot of good if you can get him to work with you. I believe they would keep ten instructional developers busy. They have vague ideas about the improvement of instruction and the use of media and really appreciate someone who knows how to translate these ideas into workable materials.
- Two fulltime professionals, one graduate assistant: curriculum analysis; course development and revision; media analysis and design; grant proposals and workshops.
- Staff helps to apply ID principles to identified problems.
- Director of ID works with faculty to write objectives, sequence instruction.
- Full media staff providing AV services.
- One instructional developer; one production technician, one coordinator to consult and assist.
- We do not practice ID in the sense of running learner and task analysis, stating objectives, and performing exhaustive and empirical formative and summative evaluations.
- The system is crazy! I must do everything even public relations.
- 70-year old nun and I consult with faculty in media production.

- Director of Faculty and Instructional Development, two Coordinators, and media staff to support development.
- Seven assistants assigned to ID director.
- Educational Communications Center staff of four plus para professionals.
- One developer, one director of media production, one director of media services provide aid to instructors.
- Three developers, three AV producers - directors, one photographer, two graphic artists, 15 student workers, 1 secretary.
- Instructional design team 1/2 instructional designer, 1/2 graphic artist, 1/2 photographer, and 1/2 TV producer.
- As the only professional staff person in the area of instructional technology, I serve many functions both in audiovisual instruction and faculty development. My training has come from a library/media background; I hold a master of library science degree and worked as the media services coordinator in an academic library. My work as instructional design specialist in my present position has developed from the role of producer of audiovisual media to design consultant.

V. ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS

Analysis of raw data

In compiling the final tabulations and descriptive responses, the author took every care to make sure that the information gathered was recorded accurately and usefully. Much of the data can be summarized from the questionnaire in the following:

1. Most of the respondents (172) hold faculty rank.
2. The majority (81) of the respondents are Media Directors, plus 15 listed as Directors, 8 AV Coordinators, and 18 AV Directors. Only 18 respondents were listed as Instructional Development personnel.

3. The largest number (52) of respondents reported directly to a Dean of Instruction, 46 to the Director of Instructional Development, 45 to a Vice-President, 30 to Academic Dean, 20 to a Director of Learning Development Center, and various other patterns including 15 to the President.
4. The majority of respondents have not been in the present position very long: 71 respondents in their first year; 59 in their second year; 34 in their third year...
5. Most respondents either held a librarian or media position.
6. The largest number (71) of age represented was 35-39.
7. 143 reported that they are full time without tenure; 120 full time with tenure, and 18 listed as part time.
8. 158 reported no part time administrative appointment; 64 on part time, and 63 reported full time appointments.
9. Several schools were reported as institutions from which respondents received the highest degrees. Correlating the highest degree held with the current position the following groupings represent the final tabulations:

Total	Position	Highest degree held				
		Bachelor's	Masters	Ph.D	Ed.D.	Other
24	Librarian	-	20	4	-	-
163	Media Personnel	2	107	30	4	20
18	Instructional Dev.	-	-	18	-	-
80	Other	-	35	38	-	7

10. 54 respondents reported current appointments in the Library; 118 reported appointments in Media; 15 appointments in Instructional Development, and 98 other appointments.

11. 189 reported that they are not the head of an academic department and 96 are heads.

12. 134 reported reading 1-5 professional journals in their academic field and 175 reported reading in issues in higher education.

13. Correlating professional writings with positions held, the results are as follows: 184 responded with no publications in the last year; 23 published a year ago and 29 published two years ago.

	Positions Held			
One year ago	Librarians	Media Personnel	ID	Other
23 publications	3	7	13	-
Two years ago				
29 publications	3	10	13	3
Three years ago				
20 publications	1	5	8	6
Four years ago				
17 publications	0	7	10	0

14. 121 respondents are currently engaged in scholarly or research work expecting it to be published 164 are not.

15. 127 respondents are both interested in teaching and research with more interest (learning) to teaching.

16. Correlating regional or national conventions attended with current positions the results are: 98 reported not attending any conventions in the last year.

	Positions Held			
One Year ago	Librarians	Media	ID	Other
48 attended	9	20	17	2
Two years ago				
60 attended	10	30	17	3
Three years ago				
27 attended	7	9	10	2

17. 128 respondents reported no hours spent in teaching; 38 spend three hours per week; 30 spend six to eight, and 23 spend nine to fifteen hours per week.

18. 60 respondents estimate that six to ten percent of the faculty are interested in Instructional Development, 46 report 16-20% interested, and 44 report two to five percent.

19. 80 respondents indicated no Instructional Development program; 56 separate AV and ID; and, 93 indicated integrated AV and ID.

20. 40 respondents listed AV production as ID activity; 47 listed ID activities, and 80 listed no ID program activity.

21. Specific problems listed by respondents:

Problem Number			Responses
2	-	lack of funding:	54
1	-	traditional faculty:	45
6	-	lack of ID personnel:	40
3	-	lack of Administrative support:	31
4	-	insufficient development time:	22
	-	other	

22. Solutions Listed:

Problem # 2

Educate administration, grant writing, involve faculty, additional fund seeking.

Problem # 1

Involve faculty in ID committees, seek models and develop applications, workshops and demonstrations.

Problem # 6

Seek administrative aid, request assistance, grant money for faculty development, add support services directors.

Problem # 3

Create a Faculty and Instructional Development Office, change

administration, expand topics and activities to include administration.

Problem # 4

Organize committees, seek grants for released time, assess priorities.

23. Various patterns and work styles were reported as how one works with faculty to improve teaching and learning. Much of the descriptions listed library work as the main activity, another group of respondents described their services as providing media equipment and production, the ID group discussed extensive design, development, and evaluation activity.

24. The description of the Instructional Development staffs and their unique services to faculty were described by various organizational ID systems or operations felt by respondents as providing ID. Librarians described the services provided by the library as ID activities; media specialist described media services including pick up and delivery of films, production, videotaping as their ID activity, and the Instructional Developers listed their staff and complete ID input to the faculty.

Implications

Instructional Development can be defined as a systemized approach to improve the quality of instruction at an institution through human and technical resources. Such instructional development activity includes consulting with faculty to assess their needs, writing behavioral objectives, developing alternative teaching strategies, producing learning materials, and evaluating, revising instruction. Much of the activity as listed by the respondents described segments of the ID process and featured skills and activities as related to library or media personnel in the "pure" sense of job descriptions. Perhaps, future studies would reveal an insight into what exactly is meant

by Instructional Development from the point-of-view of each professional.

Instructional Development personnel, as example, of Lawrence Belle, Director of Instructional Development at Rochester Institute of Technology, and Ron McBeath, Director of the Learning Resource Center at San Jose State University, have provided a sample of ID in action including Faculty and Instructional Development. It is the author's suggestions that these examples be studied as a means of gathering a "feeling" and knowledge of what ID is all about.

In this survey, many respondents described their frustrations and lack of leadership in their present position. Specifically, a number of respondents spoke out about their location --- either joining library and media services, media and instructional development, or academic departments and instructional services together. Perhaps without the lack of understanding of the other position, anxiety and frustration abound. Cooperation between the Centers is an important element in implementing instructional innovations and improvement on a campus. As indicated in the discussion on instructional development and media (pp. 3-9) there are advantages and disadvantages for "joining forces." With proper administrative care and input, this cooperation should become a vital part of the overall services.

It appears that the respondents have recognized their problems and established solutions to follow. Much duplication of problems and solutions were reported.

In terms of publications written and national conferences attended, it appeared that for the total number of respondents, this is one area that was down. Further publications and support of national organizations should be encouraged.

VI. FINAL COMMENTS

The questionnaire did identify those individuals responsible for faculty programs. The numbers were fewer than expected by the author. The services and direction offered by each program were described realizing that each program was different, few were alike. The relationships of the development program to other institutional programs reporting to support teaching and learning was described at each institution. This relationship is clearly affected by the administrative officers, specific training and background of each professional (media, library, and ID) and their perception of the other's role and input to the campus.

The larger percentage of respondents (73%) determined to whom the questionnaire should be sent and either recongnized that there was no Instructional Development activity or sent the form to the appropriate professional in ID. The other group (23%) clearly did not describe ID activity or determine to whom it should be sent.

The survey, then, did gather the information as set forth in the memo to Directors of Media. Further analysis by the reader is welcome and may be forwarded to the author.

VII. DIRECTORY OF RESPONDENTS

(For various reasons, many respondents chose to be anonymous)

Susan P. Smith
Library Coordinator of Media Services
Evergreen State College
Olympia, Washington 98505
(206) 866-6270

J. Fyle Edberg
Director of Library Services
Norwalk Communicty College
333 Wilson Avenue
Norwalk, CT 06854
(203) 853-2040

Dr. John R. Hinton
Dean, Instructional Services
Cabrillo College
6500 Soquel Drive
Aptos, CA. 95003
(408) 425-6296

B.H. Parsley
Library Director
Cambellsville College
Cambellsville, Ky 42718
(502) 465-4710

D. Ivan Timm
Media Service Librarian
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky
(606) 858-3581

Lavonne Miller
Librarian
3501 First Ave.
Evansville, Ind. 47710
(812) 426-2865

Fay C. Schreibman
Head, Media Resources Dept.
George Washington University Library
2130 H. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20052
(202) 676-6378

John M. Zulick
Media Director
Central Conn. State College
1615 Stanley St.
New Britain, Conn. 06050
(208) 827-7263

Dr. Meredith L. Carter
Director of Instruction
Indiana Vocational Technical College
1315 E. Washington St.
Indianapolis, In. 46202
(317) 635-6100

Gloria Mashburn, Director
Library-Media Center
Skagit Valley College
2405 College Way
Mount Vernon, WA. 98273
(206) 428-1111

Jerry Donen, Director
Eastern Washington University
Cheney, Wa. 99004
(509) 359-2265

Sister Anita Talar
Library Director
Farley Memorial Library
Georgian Court College
Lakewood, New Jersey 08701
(201) 364-2209

Donald S. Mayo, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean of Instruction
Chabot College
25555 Hesperian Blvd.
Hayward, Ca. 34545
(415) 786-6755

William Schmid
Director, Media Services
211 Educational Media Center
Illinois State University
Normal, Il 61761
(309) 436-5461

Joseph Lugo
Media Services Dir.
Gavilan Community College
5055 Santat Teresa blvd.
Gilroy, Ca. 95020
(408) 847-1400 x 325

Dr. John L. DeBeer
Director, Instruction Resources Center
CalvinCollege
3201 Burton, Mich. 49506
(616) 949-4000 x 334

Betty L. Kyger
Educational Development Officer
Lincoln Land Community College
Shepherd Road
Springfield, Il 62707
(217) 786-2265

Josephine H. Kock
Coordinator of Learning Resources
Learning Resources Center
Whatcom Community College

Gerald T. Hanson
Associate Prof. of Geography
Geography SH 606
University of Arkansas, at LR
Little Rock, Arkansas
(501) 569-3249

Richard Stowe, Director
Instructional Resources Center,
SUNY Plattsburgh
Plattsburgh, NY 12901
(518) 564-2111

George Bynon, Director
Instructional Media Center
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(503) 696-3091

F. Ron Pierce
Coordinator, Instructional Media
West Los Angeles College
4800 Freshman Drive
Culver City, CA
(213) 836-7110

C. Bruce Whitney Fr.
Director, Media Services
Carson-Newman College
PO Box 2039
Jefferson City, Tenn. 37760
(615) 475-9016 x 217

Library Staff
Mount Mercy College
McAuley Library
1330 Elmhust Drive N.E.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402

Learning Resource Center
Vernon Regional Junior College
Wilbarger County Junior College District
4400 College Drive
Vernon, Texas 76384

John America
Coordinator-Instructional/Media Center
Prof. Spanish
Ulster county Community College
Stone Ridge, N.Y. 12484
(914) 687-7621

Richard M. Cole
Coordinator of Media Services
Gaston College
Dallas Highway
Dallas, North Carolina
(704) 922-3136

B.W. Hartman
Dean of Instruction
701 Third
Boonville. MO 65233
(816) 883-5623

Ronald E. Remy
Director, Audio Visual Center
Norht Hall 23C
Mansfield State College
Mansfield, Pa. 16933
(717) 662-4138

Karl A. Perkins
Director
communications Center
Station #200
U of Montevallo
Montevallo AL 35115
(205) 665-2521 x315

Donald G. Emler
Ast. Prof. Christian Educ.
Centenary College
Shreveport, LA 71104
(318) 869-5273

Mary Hanby Dudley
Asst. to the President
Howard College
1001 Birdwell Lane
Big Spring, Texas 79720
(915) 267-6311

Marvin Gunter
Asst. Prof.
S.A.C. Library
Box 55
Keene, 76059
(817) 645-3921

Dr. Jean T. Kreamer
Director USL Media Services
USL PO #40396
Lafayette, LA. 70504
(318) 264-6780

Kerry Green
Director of Audio-Visual Services
William Paterson College/Library
300 Pompton Road
Wayne, New Jersey 07470
(201) 595-2307

Alan Soell
AV Coordinator
National College of Chiropractic
200 E. Roosevelt Rd.
Lonbard, IL 60148
(312) 629-2000 x59

Tom Taylor
Dir. Prog. Dev.
Spartan School of Aeronautics
Box 51133
Tulsa, OK 74151
(918) 836-6886

Maureen James-Barnes
Assistant Librarian
University of Arkansas at LR
33rd and Univ.
Little Rock AR 72204
569-3120

J.E. Bierce
Head, Media Comm
Sioux Falls College
Sioux Falls, S.D.
(605) 336-2850 x210

Charles L. Faires
Director
Education Media Center
University of Tennessee
Claxton Education Building Rm 305
Knoxville, TN. 37916
(615) 974-4101

Ms. Letitia Fabricius
Coord. of AV Services
Learning Resource Center
Chesapeake College
Wye Mils. MD 21679
(301) 822-5400 x 56 or 57

Mary Anna Brown
Director, Learning Resource Center
Seward County Community College
Box 1137
Liberal, KS 67901
(316) 524-1951

Raeburn M. Hagen
Assis. Dean for Library & Media Services
Grays Harbor College
College Heights
Aberdeen, Washington 98520
532-9020

Roger Parker
Director
Inst. Media Center
Cal State Univ.
Haxward CA 94611
(415) 881-3693

Edward A. Bachmann
Audiovisual Director
Seattle University
10th & E. Madison
Seattle, WA 98122
(206) 626-6588

Dennis W. Fleniken
Director of Instructional Service
Arkansas Tech University
Russellville, AR 72801
(501) 968-0356

Dr. Gene Kerstiens
Associate Dean
El Camino College
Torrance, CA 90506
(213) 532-3670

Harry Webb, Director
Audio Visual Center
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105

Duane Muir
Head AV Technology Dept.
Nashville, Tech.
120 White Bd. Rd.
Nashville TN 37209
(615) 741-1229

Jack Christ
Assoc. Director, College Relations
Ripon College
Ripon, WI 54971
(414) 748-6193

David B Mead
Media Director
P.O. Box 643
U.T. Dallas Richardson
TX 75080
(214) 690-2949

Alfred P. Large, Jr.
Supervisor of Audiovisual Services
Indiana University at South Bend
1700 Mishawaka Ave.
South Bend, IN
(219) 237-4488

John LaTrielle
Director of Inst. Devel.
Weber State College
Ogden Utah
626-6411

A. O'Brien
Director
Media/Arts Center
New York Institute of Technology
Old Westborg, N.Y. 11568
(516) 686-7700

Dr. Edward D. Garten
Coordinator, Instructional Development
Moorhead State University
Moorhead, Minnesota
(218) 236-2922

Peggy Piz
Producer/Director of Instructional TV
Navavro College
Highway 31 West
Corsicana Texas 75110
(214) 874-6501 x289

Edgar Bernstein
Media Center Director
Keene State College
Main St.
Keene, N.H. 03431

Billy Lytal
Director Learning Res. Center
Miss College
Box 4254
Clinton MS
924-5131

Dr. Paul Gericke
Director of the Library/Media center
New Orleans Theologien Seminary
3939 Gentilly Blvd.
New Orleans, LA 70126
(504) 282-4455 x279

Dr. M.M. Purser
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry
UALR
Little Rock, AR 72204
(501) 569-3152

L. Lynn Hogue
Asst. Prof. of Law
UALR School of Law
400 W. Markhom
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 371-1071

Scott K. Seaman
Asst. Director/Learning Resources Center
Northern Michigan University
Marquette MI 49855
(906) 227-1300

Dr. James D. Russell
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
(317) 749-2589

Tien Lu Chu
Assoc. Prof.
AV Office
Stevenson Library
Lock Haven State College
L.H., PA
(717) 248-5351

H. Gene Steffen
Dir. Instructional Resources
Buffalo College (SUNY)
1300 Elmwood Ave.
Buffalo, N.Y. 14222
(716) 878-4104

Robert C. Evans
Chairperson Inst. Dev. Comm.
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Department of Educational Foundations
Little Rock, AR 72204
(501) 569-3214

John D. Bardwell
Director
Dept of Media Services, Diamond Library
University of New Hampshire
Durham, N.H. 03824
(603) 862-2240

Margaret J. Lyons
Director of Audiovisual Services
Manatee Junior College
P.O. Box 1237
Bradenton, Florida 33506
(813) 755-1511

Curtis J. McCarty
Director, Independent Learning Center
San Diego Mesa College
7250 Mesa College Drive
San Diego, CA 92111
(714) 279-2300 x355

Cress Suckle
AV Director
Anoka-Ramsey Comm. College
Audio Visual Dept.
11200 Miss. Blvd. N.W.
Coon Rapids, Mn. 55433

Khan M. Hassan
Assistant Librarian for
Audio-Visual Services
Idaho State University
Campus Box 8064
Pocatello, Idaho 83209
(208) 236 3212

Aileen Harlow
Media Librarian
Housatonic Community College
510 Barnum Ave.
Bridgeport CT
359-7417

John Richard Ubert
Dean, Academic Affairs
Peirce Junior College
1420 Pine Street
Phila PA 19102
(215) K15-6400

Sebiletso Matabane
Director of Learning Resources Services
Autin Community College
P.O. Box 2165,
Autin, Texas 78768
(512) 476-6381

Donna A. Nickel
Director of Curriculum &
Insturtional Development Center
Valencia Community College
Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802
(205) 299 5000 x7220

Dr. Joseph W. Slade
Director of Communications Center
Long Island University
University Plaza
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201
(212) 834-6036

James H. Thomas
Program Chairman
Instructional Media Technology
Texas State Technical Institute
Waco, Texas 76705
(817) 799-3611 x 476

Martin S. Friedman
Instructional Development Consultant
Instructional Resources Center
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711
(302) 738-2685

George J. Theisen
Director, Audiovisual and TV Center
Western Connecticut State College
181 White St.
Danbury, Ct. 06810
(203) 797-4307

Vaughn Winslow
Director, AV Services
Indiana Unive. South east
4201 Grant Line Rd.
New Albany, IN 47150

Jan W. Cureton
Instructional Development Consultant
Audiovisual Center
C-215 East Hall
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
(319) 353-3724

Gary Lietke
Director, Educ. Media Center
Concordia College
2811 N.E. Holman
Portland, OR 97211
(503) 288-9371 x272

Daniel Templeton
Coordinator of Media Services
P.O. Box 69
Aims Community College
Greeley Colo. 80631
351-6139

Rich Montori
A/V Supervisor
980 Fremont Blvd.
Monterey, CA 93950
(408) 649-1150 x351

Miriam Holland
Instructional Design Specialist
Campus Box 2242
Elon College
Elon, N.C. 27244
(919) 584-9711 x445

Jay Kaufman
Director of Media
Rampo College Media Center
505 Ramapo Valley Rd.
Mahwah, NJ 07430
(201) 825-2800 x268

Janet Bedford
Media Director
Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois 61701
(309) 556-3223

Kayte Serumgard
Director of Instructional Media
Griswold Communications Center
Northwood Institute
Midland, Michigan 48640
(517) 631-1600

David Beavers
Director
12 Peabody Hall, IMC
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(501) 575-2946

Lawrence G. Miller
Production Supervisor
Center for Instructional Media Development
12 Peabody Hall,
Univ. of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72501
(501) 575-2947

Shirley B. Lee
Director, Learning Resources Center
Bethune-Cookman College
Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015
(904) 255-1401 x318

Alan R. Mikula
Sr. Instructional Services Spec.
Penn State University
110 Smith Bldg.
Altoona PA 16603
(814) 946-4321

Dr. LaVerne Miller
Director of Learning Resources
Montgmery College
Takiwa Park, Maryland 20782
(301) 587-4090 x289

Robert L. Lhota
Director of Learning Resources
Dodge City Community College
Dodge City, KS 67801
(316) 225-1321 x249

W.J. Stradley
Director of Instructional Development
& Media Services
Humboldt State University
(707) 826-3322

Paul R Lawrence
Director of Instructional Media
Pittsburg State University
Pittsbur KS 66782
(316) 231-7000

Peter Chesebrough
Media Design & Production Specialist
Valencia Community College
Box 3028,
Orlando Florida 32802
299-5000

James A Shuff
Coor. Media Service
Box 641
Henderson State Univ.
Arkadelphia AR
246-5511

Estar Baur
Director
900 Fallin
Oakland, CA
(415) 763-4791

Dr. Fred E. Hill
Director, Production Services
CH 30
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud. MN 56301
(612) 255-2068

Joe Chun
Director, Educational Media
Kaysiolani Community College
620 Pensacola Street
Honululu, Hi
531-4654

Gerald R. Brong
Assistant Director
Instructional Media Services
Washington St. University
Pullman WA 99164
(509) 335-4535

C.H. Pattishall
Coordinator of Audio Visual Services
Kennesaw College
P.O. Box 444
Marietta, GA 30061
(404) 422-8770 x252

Dr. Ibrahim M Hefzallah
Director, Educational Media Division
Fairfield University
North Benson Road
Fairfield CT 06430
(203) 255-5411

Gaylord Larsen
Media Spec.
4667 Telegrah Rd.
Ventura College
Ventura CA 93003
(805) 642-3211

Richard K. Zimmer
Director, Audio-Visual Media Services
Sul Ross State Univ.
Alpine, TX 79830
(915) 837-3461

James H. Spear
AVD
Winona State University
Winona, MN. 55987
(507) 457-2016

Kent J. Sheets
Director, Telecommunication Services
Siena Heights College
1247 E. Siena Heights Drive
Adrian, MI 49221
(517) 263-0731

Mr. Keith E. Yoder
Department Chairman
Assistant Professor
Educational Media Department
Ganser Library
Millersville State College
(717) 872-5411

Dr. Charles Vleck
Director, IMC
Central Washington University
Ellensburg, Wash. 98926
(509) 963-1221

Gene L. Post
Prof & Director of Learning Services
Pt. Loma College
3900 Lomaland Dr.
San Diego, CA 92106
222-6474

Linda Powers
Director, Media Center
Wofford College
Spartan burg, SC 29301
585 -4821 x282

James Dague
Assoc Professor
Ed. Dept.
John Carroll University
University Hts. OH
491-4331

Ann Biggs
Assistant Librarian
Jefferson Davis St. Jr. College
P.O. Drawer N
Brewton, AL
(205) 867-4832

James Vincent
Media Coordinator
Kent State University
Stark Regional Campus
6000 Frank Rd.
Canton, Hoio 44720
(216) 499-9600

Milo D. Stahl
Director of Learning Resources
Eastern Mennonite College
Harrisonburg, VA 22801
(703) 433-2771 x 219 or 148

Rick P. Williamson
Media Director/Satellife Coord.
Bethany College
Bethany, W.V. 26032
(304) 829-7908

Mel Nickerson, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Instructional Media Center
California State College, Stanislaus
800 Monte Vista Ave.
Turlock, CA 95380
(209) 633-2217

Stephen B Erickson
Chairperson
College of St. Scholastica
Media Arts Dept.
1200 Kenwood Ave.
Duluth, MN 55811
(218) 728-3631

Lames Lied
Director, Media Development
640 Central Library
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
475-6436

Jim Verrinder
Director of Telecommunications services
Modesto Junior College
P.O. Box 4065
Modesto, CA 95352
(209) 526-2000

Mary James
Director, Media Services
Middle Tennessee State University
Learning Resources Center
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
(615) 898-2892

E.S. Cridge
Head-Dept. Media Services
113 Eielson Bldg.
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
(901) 479-7296

Gene W. Schoks
Director & Assoc. Prof.
Audio Visual Center
Eastern Illinois University
Challeston, ILL 61920
(217) 581-3113

Laverna M. Sounders
Director, Learning Resource Center
Union College, Box 502
Barbourville, KY 40906
(606) 546-4151

Charles W. Johnson
Manager, Educational Communications Cen.
Suny Canton Ag & Tech College
Canton, N.Y. 13617
(315) 386-7227

David Hart
Assistant Librarian
University of Michigan-Flint
Library
Flint, MI 48503
(313) 762-3419

Elaine V. DesRosiers
Director, Educational Media
Rm 9 Center of Continuing Ed.
P.O. Box 542
Notre Dame IN 46556
(219) 283-1829

Richard L. Wilkerson
Director-Learning Resources
Crafton Hills College
11711 Sand Canyon Rd.
Yucaipa, CA 92399
(714) 794-2171 x259 or 248

Robert Freiburger
Director
Instructional Resources Center
State University College
Geneseo, NY 14454
(715) 245-5576

Robert A Rehn
Dir., Media Services
Loyola University of Chicago
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, ILL. 60611
(312) 670-2827

Robert Schwindt
Media Center Director
State Fair Community College
1900 Clarendon Rd.
Sedalia MO 653 01
(816) 826-6524

Ed Wansbury
AV Supervisor
Southeastern Seminary Library
P.O. Box 752
Wake Forest, N.C. 27587
(919) 556-2655

James E. Coufal
Director
SUNY College of Environmental Sci. & Forestry
School of Forest Technology (Ranger school)
Wanakena NY 13695
(315) 848-2566

Dr. Dean N. Osterman, Coordinator
College and University Teaching Project
and Instructional Development
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
(503) 754-2121

Dr. David Glenday
Inst. Dev. Specialist
DeAnza College
21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
(408) 996-4874

Carl Cottingham
Assoc. Dean-Learning Resources Services
John A. Logan College
Carterville, Ill. 62918
(618) 985-3741 x279

Robert O. Ross
Division Head
Tompkins Cortland Community College
170 North St.
Dryden, NY 13053
(607) 844-8211

Dr. Nancy H. Vick
Director Regional Bureau of Teaching
Materials & College Media Services
Longwood College
Farmville, VA 23901
(804) 392-9384

Frank Christensen
Manage, AV services
Waubonsee Community College
Rt. 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554
(312) 466-4811 x 318

Jerry D. Holt
Director of Learning Resources
Central Virginia Comm. College
Box 4098
Lynchburg, VA
(804) 239-0321

Dory O'Donnell
Instructional Services Ass'nt.
Penna.State University
Shenango Campus
147 Shenango Ave.
Sharon, PA 16146
98101640 x58

Ron J. McBeath
Director
Instructional Resources Center
San Jose State University
San Jose 95192
(408) 277-3411

Dr. John A. Kalmbach
Media Specialist & Assoc. Prof of Tech. Media
Technological Media Center
The University of Toledo
2801 W. Bancroft
Toledo, Ohio 43606
(419) 537-2096

Walter V. Hanclosky
Director of Media Center
Ursuline College
2550 Lander Rd.
Clev. OH 44067
(216) 449-4200 x230

Hal Skinner
Director Instr. Resources Center
Sonoma State University
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
(707) 664-2340

Bill Martin
Media Specialist
1300 Fifth
Wenatchee, WA 98801
(509) 662-1651

Khan M Hassan
Asst. Libraian for AV Services
Idaho State University
Campus Box 8064
Pocatello, ID 83209
(208) 236-3212

Dr. R.B. Golemon
Academic Dean
Ranger Jr. College
College Circle,
Ranger, Texas 76470
(817) 647-3234

Paul V. Peloquin
Director, AV Center
Box 3136
Delta State University
Cleveland, MS 38733
(601) 843-0535

Orville H. Stout
Coordinator Media Services
Fort Steilacoom Community College
9401 Farwest Dr. S.W.
Tacoma, WA
(206) 964-6550

Malcolm F. Farmer
Media Coordinator
Whither College
Whither, CA 90608
(213) 693-0771

Jay Dickinson
Co-Director of Learning Resources
2100 Moorpark Ave
San Jose City College
San Jose CA
(408) 298-2181

Richard W. Eggebeen
Readers' Services Librarian
STD Library
333 Wartbury Place
Dubuque IA 52001
(319) 556-8151

Sue Ellen Jockson
Media Services Coordinator
Cayusa Community College
Franklin Street
Auburn, N.Y. 13021
255-1743 x295

DeLeath Rives
Director Instructional Dev.
Snead State Jr. College
141 Bridlewood Drive
Gadsden, AL. 35901
442-5499 or 546-0484

Dan Wright
Director, LRC
HC 3402
Auburn Univ.
Auburn, AL 36830
(205) 826-4422

Alvin Kent
Director
Media Resources Center
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
(515) 294-8022

Lawrence Older
Administrator, Library Media
Sangamon State University
Springfield, IL
(217) 786-6550

Lisa A. Godfrey
Director, Instructional Services
Kalamayoo College
1200 Academy
Kalamagoo MI

Victor Edmonds
Instructional Designer
Our Lady of the Lake University
411 S.W. 24th St.
San Antonio, TX 78285
434-6711 x280

Tom W. Johnson
Ass't Director for AV Services
John Vaughan Library/Learning
Resources Center
Northeastern Oklahoma State University
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464
(918) 456-5511 x427

Lawrence Belle, Director
Instructional Development
Rochester Institute of Technology
One Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, New York 14623

REFERENCES

Briggs, Leslie J. Handbook of Procedures for the Design of Instruction. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1970.

Centra, John A. Strategies for Improving College Teaching. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearing house on Higher Education and the American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Corey, Jeffrey R. and McMichael, James S., "Retention in a PSI Introductory Psychology Course." Personalized Instruction: A Symposium in Honor of Fred Keller. American Psychological Association. 1971.

Davis, Robert H., Lawrence T. Alexander, and Stephen L. Yelon, Learning System Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Diamond, Robert M. and others, Instructional Development in Higher Education. Syracuse University Press, 1973.

Gaff, J.G. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Group for Human Development in Education, Faculty Development, New York: Change Magazine.

Keller, Fred S., "Goodbye Teacher." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, Vol. 1, 1968.

Kemp, Jerrold E. Instructional Design. Belmont: Fearon Design.

Osterman, Dean N. "Selection and Evaluation of Alternative Teaching Methods," Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Columbus: Collegiate Publishing, Inc.

Postlethwait, S.N. The Audio-Tutorial Approach to Learning. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1972.

Ruskin, Robert S. "The Personalized System of Instruction: An Educational Alternative.: ERIC Research Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education, 1974.

Silvern, L.C. "Cybernetic and Education, K-12." Audiovisual Instruction 13 (1968).

Ullmer, Eldon J. with Robert G. Stakenas. Instructional Development Handbook. Tallahassee, Florida: Division of Instructional Research and Service, Florida State University, 1971.

INFORMATION FUTURES
2217 - College Station
Pullman, Wa. 99163
(509) 332-5726

memorandum

TO: Directors--Media Programs
Colleges and Universities

FROM: Jerry Brong

DATE: May 25, 1979

RE: Directory of Instructional Development Personnel

Instructional media and educational technology programs are generally key elements in an institution's instructional development program. In fact, the efforts for instructional development (or faculty development) may originate with the work of personnel in your operations.

The survey form accompanying this memo is designed to gather basic data about your institution's instructional development program. Two basic goals are held for this survey. First is the establishment of a directory of personnel involved in instructional development programs. Second will be the compiled data from the information requested by the survey. (It should be noted that no specific institution will be highlighted in the data summary and that the responses about all institutions will be merged.)

Sending the survey form to you as director of media services will allow you to either provide the needed information or to make the determination as to who should provide that information and then route the form to that individual for a response. Provision of the requested information from your vantage point (or the vantage point of the person to whom you route the form) should insure that the role of media programs in instructional and faculty development is reported.

The responses to the survey will be compiled by Dean Osterman (Oregon State University) into a directory of programs. Osterman will also carry the responsibility to tabulate, analyze, and present the data gathered in the survey. In summary, he will provide a narrative about instructional improvement programs. Specific questions on the survey and directory should be directed to Osterman.

The directory will be distributed by INFORMATION FUTURES in the fall of 1979. Publications notices will be distributed when it is available.

Your assistance in obtaining the needed information will contribute to the success of this project. Either provide the information requested on the form or have the information provided by a colleague familiar with the instructional development program. If necessary, duplicate the survey form and distribute it to multiple program centers within your institution, if such multiple centers exist.

PLEASE HAVE THE RESPONSES RETURNED TO DEAN OSTERMAN BY JULY 15, 1979.

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

May, 1979

Please complete and return to:

Dr. Dean N. Osterman
College and University Teaching Project
Instructional Resources and
Materials Center
Kidder Hall 109
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Telephone: 503-754-2121

Date _____

Name _____ Title _____

Business Address _____

_____

_____ Telephone _____

Do you hold faculty rank _____ Faculty title _____

Title of position to which you report _____

Number of years in present position _____

Previous position _____

_____ What is your present age?

(1) under 25 (2) 25-29 (3) 30-34
(4) 35-39 (5) 40-44 (6) 45-49
(7) 50-54 (8) 55-59 (9) 60 or over

_____ What kind of academic appointment do you have?

(1) full time with tenure (2) full time without tenure
(3) part time with tenure (4) part time without tenure
(5) other

_____ Do you have a part time administrative appointment?
(1) yes (2) no

Write in the name of the school from which you received your highest degree _____

In what department is your current appointment? _____

_____ Are you currently the head of an academic department or academic division?
(1) yes (2) no

_____ What is the highest earned degree you hold?
(1) undergraduate Bachelor's or less (2) Master's
(3) Ph.D. (4) other

_____ How many professional journals in or related to your academic field of interest do you read? (Estimate all those that you receive or refer to on a regular basis.)

_____ How many journals do you receive or read regularly that deal with higher education in general or with teaching or teaching aids or methods?

_____ How many regional or national conventions of your discipline have you attended in the past two years?

_____ How many professional writings of any kind have you had published or accepted for publication in the past two years?

_____ Are you currently engaged in any scholarly or research works which you expect will lead to publication?

_____ Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or research?
(1) very heavily in research (2) both, but leaning to research
(3) both, but leaning to teaching (4) very heavily in teaching

_____ How many regional or national conventions devoted to issues of teaching, learning or higher education have you attended in the past two years?

_____ How many hours a week do you usually spend in the classroom teaching?

_____ With which of the following groups do you have the strongest identity or sense of belonging?
(1) my academic department or division
(2) my discipline generally
(3) my institution
(4) my students
(5) a special interest group across departmental lines
Please name: _____

_____ What percentage of your faculty would you estimate to be interested in Instructional Development?

The following questions can be answered with a short narrative answer on a separate paper and returned with the questionnaire.

What sorts of working relationships does Instructional Development have with the Audio-visual departments on your campus?

Briefly outline or describe the Instructional Development activities that are provided for teachers and/or students at your institution.

What "problems" are faced by Instructional Development on your campus; in other words, where and what are the obstacles confronting Instructional Development activities?

What solutions or steps have been taken to resolve these "problems"?

Describe how you work with faculty to improve their teaching and learning environment.

Briefly, describe the Instructional Development staff and their unique services to faculty.

Your assistance by providing responses to these questions is appreciated.